

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

STARVONA HARRIS, ET AL.,
Plaintiffs,
v.
BEST BUY STORES, L.P.,
Defendant.

Case No. [4:17-cv-00446-HSG](#) (KAW)

**ORDER TERMINATING STARVONA
HARRIS'S MOTION FOR
PROTECTIVE ORDER**

Re: Dkt. Nos. 34, 35

On June 3, 2017, Plaintiff Starvona Harris filed a motion for protective order to prevent Defendant Best Buy from deposing her in this lawsuit in light of her prior deposition in the related case, *Starvona Harris v. Best Buy Stores, L.P.*, Case No. 15-cv-00657-HSG. (Pl.'s Mot., Dkt. No. 35 at 1.) On June 5, 2017, the pending motion and all other discovery disputes were referred to the undersigned. (Dkt. No. 39.)

Pursuant to the undersigned's standing order, discovery disputes between the parties must be addressed in a joint letter. (Judge Westmore's General Standing Order ¶ 13.) Accordingly, The Court TERMINATES the motion for protective order and orders the parties to meet and confer in good faith to resolve the dispute without further court intervention.

To aid the parties in their meet and confer efforts, a cursory review of Plaintiff's motion indicates that she mistakenly relies on *Hynix Semiconductor Inc. v. Rambus Inc.*, 250 F.R.D. 452, 454 (N.D. Cal. 2008), in support of her position that she is entitled to a protective order. (Pl.'s Mot. at 9.) *Hynix* is easily distinguishable on the facts, as it was one of three, related patent cases, and, to minimize the number of depositions, the district court issued a case management order that required that

[a]ll depositions or other sworn testimony in the Rambus Related Actions may be used by any party in the Rambus NDCal Cases as if


1 taken in each of the Rambus NDCal Cases. A party shall be allowed
2 to take a further deposition with respect to new issues with which it
is concerned. A party shall not repeat prior lines of questioning of a
deponent.

3 250 F.R.D. at 454. Indeed, in *Hynix*, the court held a lengthy case management conference and
4 solicited competing case management proposals before adopting the “cross-use” provision
5 Plaintiff seeks to have the Court impose. *Id.* at 456. The undersigned, however, is unaware of a
6 similar order being entered in this case.

7 In the event that the parties’ meet and confer efforts fail to fully resolve this dispute, they
8 shall file a joint letter not to exceed five pages, in which they provide a detailed summary of each
9 party’s final substantive position, including relevant legal authority. *Id.*

10 IT IS SO ORDERED.

11 Dated: June 6, 2017

12 
13 KANDIS A. WESTMORE
14 United States Magistrate Judge
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28